



REMARKS

The Applicant appreciates the Examiner's careful examination of this case. Reconsideration and re-examination are respectfully requested in view of the instant remarks.

Paragraph 1 of the Office Action has been noted.

With regard to paragraphs 2 and 3 of the Office Action, the Abstract has been amended as requested by the Examiner.

With regard to paragraph 4 of the Office Action, claims 10 and 11 have been amended as requested by the Examiner.

With regard to paragraphs 5 and 6 of the Office Action, claim 1 has been amended to specify that the first end (20) of the Applicant's handle (4) is the end that is farthest from the first and second connecting formations (16, 18). As we understand the Office Action, the Examiner was considering the originally employed word of "remote" to be such that it referred to the Applicant's handle end opposite the first end (20). Referring to the cited Remus patent, the Remus end which corresponds to the Applicant's end (20) is Remus end (18) as shown in Figures 1 and 2. The Remus end opposite the Remus end (18) is Remus end (17) as shown in Figures 1 and 2. Once it is clearly appreciated that the Applicant's first end is the end (20) and the corresponding Remus end is Remus end (18).

then it becomes immediately apparent that the Remus disclosure is the very opposite of what is stated in the Applicant's claim 1. More specifically, the Applicant's claim 1 requires that in the closed condition of the device (2) the first connecting formation (16) is further away than the second connecting formation (18) from the first end (20) of the handle (4). In Remus, using the Examiner's recited elements as set out in paragraph 6 of the Office Action, in the closed condition of the knife as shown in Remus Figure 5, the first connecting formation (84) is nearer than the second connecting formation (39) to the Remus first end (18). Similarly, in the open condition of the Applicant's device (2), the first connecting formation (16) is nearer than the second connecting formation (18) to the Applicant's first end (20). The opposite is the situation in Remus as shown in Remus Figure 7. Referring to Remus Figure 7, it is clear that the Remus first connecting formation (84) is farther than the second connecting formation (39) to the first end (18).

It is also noted that the Applicant's device (2) has one arm 12 which connects the control member (10) to the operational member (6). In Remus, this is achieved with two arms (70, 77). Similarly, the Applicant has one guide groove (14) whereas Remus has two guide grooves.

The Applicant relies for patentability of the sub-claims on the fact that the sub-claims include all of the features of claim 1, which claim 1 is believed to be allowable for the reasons specified above.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Early and favorable action is respectfully requested.

If for any reason this **RESPONSE** is found to be **INCOMPLETE**, or if at any time it appears that a **TELEPHONE CONFERENCE** with Counsel would help advance prosecution, please telephone the undersigned or one of his associates, collect in Waltham, Massachusetts, at (781) 890-5678.

Respectfully submitted,

T. Thompson

THOMAS E. THOMPSON, JR.

Reg. No. 47,136